

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/771,380	02/05/2004	Tokio Ooi	118520	3333
25944 OLIFF & BERI	7590 04/25/200 RIDGE, PLC	7	EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 1992	28		HENDRICKSON, STUART L	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1754	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		. MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/25/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

			A*
		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/771,380	OOI ET AL.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	N	Stuart Hendrickson	1754
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
- External after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. o period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we tree to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
· —	Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.	
Dispositi	ion of Claims		
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or		
Applicati	on Papers		
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Example.	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachmen	t(s)	•	
2) ☐ Notic 3) ☑ Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte

Application/Control Number: 10/771,380

Art Unit: 1754

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- A) In claim 2, 'in as heated state' is unclear as to what is heated.
- B) Claim 6 is unclear as to what if anything it requires; it appears to merely describe rather than limit.
- C) In claim 1, 'wide' is subjective and unclear, especially in the context of the invention, which is selective pore closing.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP '309.

The reference teaches treating active carbon with a hot hydrocarbon gas, which is selectively deposited in the micropores. Para 31 of the translation teaches cooling under inert gas. No differences are seen in the carbon or the effect of the treatment.

Application/Control Number: 10/771,380

Art Unit: 1754

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP '605.

The reference teaches pretreating a carbon to block pores. No differences are seen in the carbon or the effect of the treatment.

Claims 1-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP '543.

The reference teaches contacting carbon with hot organic gas. No differences are seen in the carbon or the effect of the treatment.

Claims 1-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Moore.

The reference teaches contacting carbon with hot organic gas. No differences are seen in the carbon or the effect of the treatment. See pg. 180.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Ohsaki et al. 4458022.

The reference teaches contacting carbon with hot organic gas. No differences are seen in the carbon or the effect of the treatment. See col. 4 in particular.

Claims 1-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Munzer et al. 3962129.

The reference teaches contacting carbon with hot organic gas. No differences are seen in the carbon or the effect of the treatment. See col. 3 in particular.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

Art Unit: 1754

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Hendrickson at telephone number (571) 272-1351.

Stuart Hendrickson examiner Art Unit 1754